



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Russia as the Chief Obstacle to European Rehabilitation—From the Labor Viewpoint

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

Greenwich, Connecticut, formerly United States Envoy to Russia under the Chairmanship of Elihu Root

DIPLOMATS are wrestling in Europe with the psychology, the social philosophy and the phraseology of the Bolsheviks. The diplomats have been studying these subjects for barely three years. European and American labor have been studying them, through direct relations, for fully seventeen years, since Bolshevism made its debut in Russia in 1905 at the time of the first revolutionary movement. Labor's claim to understand the Bolsheviks better than the average statesman or newspaper or article writer—or personally conducted guest of the Soviets—is in no way a claim to superior intelligence but to actual experience.

Moreover, important as the Bolsheviks are to the world at large today they are even more important to the labor movement. They have repeatedly asserted that the modern and democratic labor movement is their chief enemy and they have spent the larger part of their energies and resources in combatting and in attempting to gain control of that movement.

The Bolshevik attack on the labor movement has in no way lessened in intensity; it has merely changed in form. It is admitted that the Soviets have spent millions upon millions among the world's leading nations for the corruption of the press, especially the labor press. Their offer of \$375,000 in one lump to the London *Daily Herald* is notorious. Today they have tens of millions of gold on deposit in the Western nations, to say nothing of vast corruption funds in jewels looted

from the Russian aristocracy and the Russian church. These sums are grossly insufficient to provide the Soviet régime with the thousands of locomotives, the tens of thousands of cars, and with the other economic needs of their great empire. Applied for the purpose of bribery, or as so-called propaganda, they constitute the greatest corruption fund the world has ever known. And who will deny that these funds are in the hand of as unscrupulous a band as modern history can point to? The Soviet propaganda beyond doubt is the most heavily subsidized, the most persistent and audacious, the most untruthful, the most highly ramified and successful the world has ever known.

LABOR'S CONTACT WITH THE SOVIETS

Labor understands this propaganda and its operators far better than do those who have had less experience with it. American as well as European labor continues in the most intimate daily contact and conflict with the agencies of the Soviets. It does not need to wait for some international conference to make their acquaintance. Long before the newspapers and magazines or even the pseudo-liberals, who are such warm admirers of the Soviets, discovered the true nature of their system, international labor organizations had renounced and denounced them. The International Federation of Trade Unions, radical as it is, declared that the Soviets had formed a new autocracy and were largely responsible for the condition of the Russian people. The Second, or

Socialist International, which includes the British Labor Party, declared:

They (the Bolsheviks) trod the desires of the Russian people in the dust, and in place of a democracy they established an armed dictatorship, not of the proletariat, but of a committee. Now they are attempting to impose their will and their decrees upon the socialist and labor parties of the whole world. They belong to the old world of tsardom. . . .

They may have ended wage-slavery; they have established state-slavery and misery. They have robbed the workers of freedom of movement and of combination and are preventing the creation of economic democracy.

At its last convention, the American Federation of Labor declared that the Soviet government has no claim to represent the Russian nation. By an almost unanimous vote, opposed only by four voices out of four hundred, that convention adopted a report which thus described the Bolshevik campaign in this country:

The campaign for *de facto* recognition has been carried on with a redoubled intensity both in the subsidized revolutionary press and in certain pro-Bolshevik newspapers and weeklies. This propaganda has been particularly aggressive and misleading since the signing of a Soviet trade agreement by the British Empire—in order to protect its hold over Persia, Mesopotamia, India and other crown possessions, for the purpose of obtaining concessions for British capitalists, and for other more obscure and sinister motives of secret diplomacy. The purpose of the agitation is not only to secure prestige for the Soviet government but to make friends for the Bolsheviks and Communist International through a falsified picture of Russian conditions. This campaign has been concentrated, in large part, within the labor unions, with a view of overthrowing the bona fide labor movement of America as a condition precedent for the overthrow of the republic of the United States. . . .

Accompanying the open agitation carried

on by the Soviet government, its "liberal" sympathizers, and the irresponsible yellow press, has been an effort of the third or Communist International and of its adjunct, the new Red Labor Union International, to destroy the American labor movement by attacks from within and without—that is, by aiding the I. W. W. and at the same time forming "communist" nuclei within locals of the organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Since the meeting of the Genoa Conference and even from the time of its first announcement all this agitation has redoubled in its intensity. W. Z. Foster, recently returned from Russia, has launched a new publication and inaugurated a new movement to capture the American Federation of Labor and force it into joining the Red International, the object of which, according to its constitution, is, "together with the Communist International to organize a working class for the overthrow of capitalism, the destruction of the bourgeois state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat." The Red Trade Union International openly repudiates the very possibility of "a peaceable transition from capitalism to socialism."

LABOR'S RUSSIAN POLICY

With their thorough and complete understanding of Bolshevism and the Bolsheviks, the American unions are lined up almost solidly behind the Russian policy of the American government. However, they have worked out their attitude in somewhat more detail. The Montreal resolution (1920) declared:

That the American Federation of Labor is not justified in taking any action which could be construed as an assistance to, or approval of, the Soviet government of Russia as long as that government is based upon authority which has not been vested in it by a popular representative national assemblage of the Russian people; or so

long as it prevents the organizing and functioning of trade unions and the maintenance of a free press and free public assemblage.

Even the Cannes agenda, which was the basis of the Genoa Conference, say that in order to modernize the Soviet régime sufficiently for business purposes *regular courts* have to be constituted. European labor refuses to associate internationally with the Communist International unless the Soviets grant both *free speech* and *political amnesty* for the thousands of labor union and socialist political prisoners who fill the dungeons of the Soviets. American labor makes practically the same demands and in addition requires some form of representative government. These demands are in entire accord with the Harding-Hughes policy. Last year, Mr. Hughes refused to have any relations with the Soviets unless four basic principles of modern civilization were recognized: freedom of contract, security for property rights, personal liberty and freedom for labor. These rights cannot be guaranteed without a regular system of law courts, free speech and freedom of assembly and some form of government responsible to the people.

Mr. Hughes has laid down an additional principle of absolutely vital importance in dealing with people of this character. Bolshevik pledges being wholly worthless, the American government has declared its willingness to discuss the question of Russian relations only on the condition that there shall be not only verbal acceptance of the changes but "convincing evidence of the consummation of such changes," as well. American labor also, as its declarations show, is not interested in Bolshevik promises, and will be willing to consider the question of recognition only when convincing evidence is given that free speech,

freedom of assemblage and a representative government are clearly and definitely established.

Even the official British *White Paper*, published last year, pointed out that there could be no hope for the rehabilitation of Russia until "the policy of political oppression at home" as well as Bolshevik propaganda abroad were abandoned.

European labor also is weary of Soviet promises and demands acts. The Soviets have made their famous revolutionary tribunal or political police department, the notorious Che-Ka, a part of another department and have changed its name. This subterfuge and others like it no longer deceive European labor. Karl Folmerhaus, a member of the Famine Relief Delegation sent to Russia by the International Federation of Trade Unions, has published in the *Socialist Messenger* (No. 6, March 21, 1922) the following:

At the present moment the "Che-Ka," which I consider *the most abominable institution ever used by any government*, is subordinated to the Commissariat of Home Affairs. However, I do not think that Russian Socialists will gain anything by this "reform" for safe-guarding their political rights. I am convinced that so long as the present system of persecution is applied toward Russian Socialists, any understanding and contact between Russian Communists and the Western proletariat is quite impossible.

The Russian policy of American labor was brought down to date and restated by President Gompers last January when he declared:

I am among those who first privately and publicly urged the need for an international economic conference, but now, as then, my conviction is that such a conference should be summoned by the United States, that the United States should make the agenda, and that there is no place in such a conference for Lenine and Trotzky.

President Gompers and his labor associates favored an international economic conference. They did not favor a conference which has admittedly become as much political as economic. As to future international economic conferences, Mr. Gompers does not pledge himself to a conference held in the United States, but takes the stand it should be called *by* the United States and that *the United States should make the agenda*. His model is the Washington Conference and his authority is labor's support of the Washington Conference.

Finally, President Gompers insists—upon grounds which are those of the American Federation of Labor—that there is no place in such a conference for Lenine and Trotzky, since that would involve their *de facto* recognition as having some right to speak for the Russian people.

On this point Mr. Gompers says:

The Soviets do not constitute a *de facto* government today any more than they did a year ago. The Soviet power is today as treacherous as then. Nothing has changed except the ideas of expediency entertained by some leading European politicians.

The British government, for one, has played fast and loose with the Russian question. It succumbed to the "trade with Russia" propaganda, but it got no trade and admits that it got no trade. What it did get was a continuation of Bolshevik betrayal.

The Soviet autocracy is evidently winning a temporary victory in Europe, but there is no indication that its success will extend to the United States.

The statement that the Soviet power is treacherous is a repetition of the position taken by ex-Secretary Colby and reaffirmed by Secretary Hughes when he says America refuses to consider Bolshevik promises without actual performance:

Mr. Gompers continues:

The autocracy of Lenine is as much an autocracy today as a year ago; it is as much without democratic sanction now as then, and it is as clumsy, selfish and brutal now as then. Nothing has changed in any essential except the political leaders of Europe, who have been too much inclined all along to view the Russian situation in the light of whatever might at the moment seem expedient, in total disregard of the democratic principles and ideals and the hopes and aspirations of the great mass of the Russian people.

The political leaders of the United States are not compelled to make any concessions for the sake of political expediency and the industrial leaders long ago found out that experience with the Russian dictatorship is costly and productive only of propaganda for the dictatorship.

Applying all of these principles to the present situation and the immediate future, it is clear that American labor will fight to the finish against the effort now being made to drag the American government into another pseudo-economic conference which, whether it is held in Europe or America, would involve recognition of the Soviets and an economic entente that would maintain and prolong their power.

LABOR AND FURTHER CONFERENCES

The promoters of the Genoa Conference, however, assert that conferences will continue until the Soviet government is brought into some international arrangement on a basis of equality with other nations. This is precisely the position taken by Trotzky in his last statement where he says:

But we firmly count on the triumph of business common sense, first of all in America and afterwards in Europe. Genoa is not the last word in the pourparlers. Perhaps in the event of a break-up of the Genoa Conference, there will come a certain interval, but the pourparlers would be resumed some time later, more energetically

and much more business-like. Soviet Russia is prepared for this.

The issue of the hour is the *next* international conference. Will the American government, supported by American labor, allow itself to be pushed into a Trotzky-Lloyd-George conference through the stupendous propaganda either subsidized or stimulated by foreign governments and interests? No word has yet been uttered by our government that would make us believe that this is a remote possibility. But the danger exists, nevertheless, for if the government cannot be directly influenced by a propaganda of falsehood, public opinion can be.

American labor is fully aware of the danger and it also knows just what the influences are that are backing the pro-Soviet propaganda in this country. President Gompers pointed out the danger a few days ago as follows:

I can think of nothing that would be more fraught with disaster to humanity than American recognition of the Bolshevik power in any form—whether by entering into another “economic” conference at which America would sit cheek by jowl with Soviets, or in any other manner.

In making these assertions I am mindful of the amazing propaganda with which American public life is being flooded. I am mindful of the intrigue which is everywhere about us and above all I am mindful of the newly adopted policy of the American-Anglo-German banking group, which perhaps constitutes the most dangerous element in the whole chain of pro-Bolshevik effort in America, because it has its hands on the most power.

The truth is that predatory international finance has its appetite up and believes it sees loot in Russia.

I know of nothing more cynical than the attitude of European statesmen and financiers toward the Russian muddle. Essentially it is their purpose as laid down at Genoa to place Russia in economic vassalage and give political recognition in exchange—recognition in exchange for

concessions. They know immediate trade is not to be had, but they know that, eventually, they can get at the gold, the coal, the oil, the timber and future products of the soil.

Russia herself is on the bargain counter, behind which stands Lenine as a bandit merchant, to take what he can get and what will serve his purpose in exchange for the heritage of a people rendered helpless by him and his. America, let us hope, will continue to stand for Russian economic independence as well as political freedom.

It is my understanding that America stands by the policy that we can have no dealing with Russia until there is in that country a government answerable to the people put in office by the people. Prime requisites are elections, free press, free assemblage, free speech, none of which has existed since Lenine created his autocracy.

Mr. Gompers did not mention the cynicism of the Soviets. They may fail in their efforts to sell the inheritance of the Russian people in return for the means to tighten the hold of their tyranny. But whether they fail or succeed they have already indicated that they intend to tell their followers that it is they who have defeated the attempt of the foreign capitalists to take advantage of Russia's miseries for the purposes of plunder. Abroad this brazen falsehood will be accepted only by Communists and pseudo-liberals. But the helpless Russian people, permitted to read nothing but Bolshevik propaganda, may continue to believe it as long as the Soviet régime continues.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SOVIET RECOGNITION

Let us not be deceived as to the true significance of conference with the Soviets. It means compromise with the forces of destruction. If there were any doubt as to this it would be removed by the almost identical language used by Trotzky and Lloyd

George. In his statement of May 4 Trotzky again says that "two systems of property are carrying on pourparlers at Genoa," and that the Bolsheviks are standing for the "collective management of the working classes." The Red Army chief then continues:

The leading European diplomatists appear still to consider that the labor revolution in Russia is not the beginning of a new and historical world epoch but a mere temporary change of one form of property for another. They thought by force to induce us to the old forms of property, but this failed.

Or take the language of the Soviet reply handed to the Allies on May 11. The Soviets there portray themselves as representing "the collective tendency in social organization" engaged in conflict with "capitalistic individualism!"

Here is the very keystone of the entire Bolshevik propaganda. Yet instead of repudiating this view, what do we find Mr. Lloyd George doing? We find him deliberately adopting it. In his first memorandum on the Genoa Conference the British Premier said:

It is essential that the conflict between rival social and economic systems, which the Russian revolution so greatly intensified, should not accentuate the fears of the nations and culminate in an international war.

What else is this "conflict between rival social and economic systems, which the Russian revolution so greatly intensified" but Trotzky's world-struggle between "proletariat" and "bourgeoisie?"

THEORY OF RIVAL SOCIAL SYSTEMS

Lloyd George agrees with the Bolsheviks that it is a conflict between rival and social economic systems that is driving towards war. Now it is clearly a major object of Bolshevik diplomacy—if not the major object—

to make it appear that there is a conflict between two social systems, by which the world is being torn in half, and that the Bolsheviks represent one of the halves, the half that stands for the future and against capitalism. Far from accepting the verbose party dictatorship set up by the Bolsheviks as "a rival and social economic system," America regards it as the mad series of experiments and expedients of a small band of fanatics, unable even to conceive a social system, to say nothing of working it out against the will of their enslaved subjects, a régime able to obtain power only because of the absolutely extraordinary state of prostration and paralysis that prevailed in Russia after the overthrow of the Czar and maintained in power by the friendly attitude of certain European governments ready to pay any price for Caucasian oil and any blackmail for the demobilization of the Red army.

The Soviets, far from being regarded as a powerful rival economic and political system threatening Europe, are portrayed in Mr. Hughes' notes—and also in Mr. Hoover's characterizations—as having been incapable even of checking the progressive economic collapse of their country.

Nothing could be more false than Trotzky's declaration that Secretary Hughes is trying to dictate to the Soviets "which forms of property and what methods of legislation and management we ought to inaugurate in our own country." On the contrary, Secretary Hughes regards the forms of property, legislation, and management of the Soviets as likely to continue for the present and as quite sufficient—without any acceleration from outside rapidly to reduce their power and finally to destroy it. Mr. Hughes calls it a process of "progressive impoverishment."

It is a warfare not between two social systems but between the social system called modern civilization and the fanatic disciples of an ignorant and destructive social dogma. The same ignorant fanaticism which led the Bolsheviks to think they could take possession of the earth through a world-revolution, emanating from an incredibly backward country, leads them now to believe they can publicly force the nations of the world to make concessions to their dogma and use this new prestige further to develop their power at home and abroad.

As Mr. Frank Vanderlip has just pointed out, "Lloyd George has attempted to force compatibility between two fundamentally incompatible systems," one of which is largely responsible for "the evils that have fallen on Russia"—though the chaotic and fantastic ukases that did so much to produce the Russian disorder hardly deserve the name of system. The American financier points out that "if Mr. Lloyd George, like Lincoln, saw that Europe cannot be divided between two systems—like America at the time of the Civil War—Genoa would not have been convened." At least the Soviets would not have been invited.

Mr. Vanderlip points also to the only conceivable solution—though, again, his language is not quite accurate. He says: "Russia should have complete freedom to retain and experiment with her social order, but so long as it is communistic it must be isolated." It is not Russia which is doing the experimenting but a relatively small band of fanatics; it is not Communism which must be isolated, but this fanatical band. But the principle is sound: non-intervention and isolation as long as the Bolshevik régime continues.

There can be no rehabilitation if Europe gives a new lease of power to the most destructive régime since the days of Genghis Khan. Democratic civilization is even more fundamentally and squarely challenged by Bolshevism than it ever was by Prussianism. Ex-President Wilson had the support not only of labor but of the entire public opinion of the world when he declared during the World War that America would refuse to deal with the Kaiser and would consent to deal only with the people. That principle is even more vital to world civilization and progress, in dealing with the Russian problem.

The World's Need of International Citizenship

By ANNOT ROBINSON

Manchester, England, British Delegate and Executive Secretary of the Manchester Branch of the Women's International League

IN Europe, and perhaps as definitely in Great Britain as in any other of the countries of Europe, we have had a very hard experience since the Armistice was signed in 1918. Because of that experience abstractions in politics are not, it seems to me, of quite the same interest in Great Britain as they are in

America. We are not at the moment so interested in the question of revenge, in the questions of ethics or in the questions of moral values, in which, judging from your newspapers, your politics are involved at the present time. We have had, following upon the Armistice, a very prolonged period